

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/1/2008, have been fully considered and are persuasive. In view of Applicant's amendments dated 2/1/2008, the rejection of claims 1, 5-18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn. Additionally, the rejection of claims 1, 5, and 7-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) has been withdrawn for the reasons outlined below.
2. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

Title

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: Payment Based E-mail Printing System Utilizing Search Criteria.

Abstract

4. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.
5. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

6. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.
7. The Examiner suggests removing "There is disclosed" from the instant Abstract.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 1, 5, and 7-22 are allowed.
9. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: In interpreting the claims, in light of the specification and the claims amended in Applicant's response dated 2-1-2008, the Examiner finds the claimed invention to be patentably distinct from the prior art of record.
10. The prior art of record fails to teach either alone or in combination the limitation of *a search section for searching the output printing apparatus group managed by the managing section for one candidate output printing apparatus or a plurality of candidate output printing apparatuses in response to a search request having search conditions from a transportable terminal apparatus, a notifying section for notifying said transportable terminal apparatus of the mail address of said candidate output printing apparatus or the plurality of candidate output printing apparatuses found in a search by the search section, wherein the transportable terminal apparatus issues an electronic mail to a destination mail address of a designated output printing apparatus, and wherein the destination mail address is based upon the mail address of said candidate*

output printing apparatus or the plurality of candidate output printing apparatuses provided by the search section, in combination with other limitations as claimed in independent claims 1, 17, and 19-20.

11. **Mitsuya (JP 11312068)** teaches a print server system which correlates e-mail addresses and ports of printing output devices. However, in the prior art of Mitsuya, e-mail addresses of printing output devices are specifically linked to a user e-mail address rather than a search request having search conditions from a transportable terminal apparatus, as claimed. Further, the prior art of Mitsuya utilizes the print server as an intermediary for all communications between the user device and printing output devices, and as such fails to explicitly teach wherein the transportable terminal apparatus issues an electronic mail to a destination mail address of a designated output printing apparatus, as claimed in independent claims 1, 17, and 19-20 (**Mitsuya, Para. 0070-0071, 0082-0088**).

12. **Fujisawa (JP 11312065)** teaches a printer searching system which allows for user specification of search criteria and which returns a list of printers meeting the criteria. Fujisawa teaches user-based search criteria including paper size, printer name, font, etc. A list of identified printers is returned to a user thereby permitting printing to a printer which meets the user specified criteria. However, Fujisawa fails to explicitly teach the use of identifying printers based upon an e-mail address, and fails to explicitly teach wherein a transportable terminal apparatus issues an electronic mail to a

destination mail address of the designated printing apparatus, as claimed in independent claims 1, 17, and 19-20 (**Fujisawa, Para. 0038-0047, 0057-0066**).

13. **Srinivasan (US 6,452,689)** teaches a network based copying (printing) system in which an accounting processor is used prior to outputting of information in an e-mail, and allowing a designated output printing apparatus to produce output of information included in the e-mail from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing. However, Srivasan teaches the use of a webpage interface for submitting print jobs, and fails to explicitly teach the use of a search request, or notifying a user of printers which meet specified criteria in an e-mail-based system, as claimed in independent claims 1, 17, and 19-20 (**Srinivasan, Col. 2 lines 4-20, Col 4 lines 25-44**).

14. Claim 18 is allowed based on its dependency upon independent claim 17, and the addition of further limitations

15. Claim 22 is allowed based on its dependency upon independent claim 1, and the addition of further limitations.

16. The prior art of record fails to teach either alone or in combination the limitation of *a first server comprising an address managing section for managing a mail address for each of said printers, a search section for searching said printer group managed by a managing section for one candidate printer or a plurality of candidate printers in response to a search request having search conditions from a client, and an*

address notifying section for notifying said client of the mail address of said one candidate printer or the plurality of candidate printers found in a search by the search section, wherein the client issues an electronic mail to a destination mail address of a designated printer, and wherein the destination mail address is based upon the mail address of said candidate printer or the plurality of candidate printers provided by the notifying section, in combination with other limitations as claimed in independent claims 5 and 21.

17. **Mitsuya (JP 11312068)** teaches a print server system which correlates e-mail addresses and ports of printing output devices. However, in the prior art of Mitsuya, e-mail addresses of printing output devices are specifically linked to a user e-mail address rather than a search request having search conditions from a transportable terminal apparatus, as claimed. Further, the prior art of Mitsuya utilizes the print server as an intermediary for all communications between the user device and printing output devices, and as such fails to explicitly teach wherein the client issues an electronic mail to a destination mail address of a designated output printing apparatus, as claimed in independent claims 5 and 21 (**Mitsuya, Para. 0070-0071, 0082-0088**).

18. **Fujisawa (JP 11312065)** teaches a printer searching system which allows for user specification of search criteria and which returns a list of printers meeting the criteria. Fujisawa teaches user-based search criteria including paper size, printer name, font, etc. A list of identified printers is returned to a user thereby permitting printing to a

printer which meets the user specified criteria. However, Fujisawa fails to explicitly teach the use of identifying printers based upon an e-mail address, and fails to explicitly teach wherein a client issues an electronic mail to a destination mail address of the designated printing apparatus, as claimed in independent claims 5 and 21 (**Fujisawa, Para. 0038-0047, 0057-0066**).

19. **Srinivasan (US 6,452,689)** teaches a network based copying (printing) system in which an accounting processor is used prior to outputting of information in an e-mail, and allowing a designated output printing apparatus to produce output of information included in the e-mail from a transportable terminal apparatus after executing a charging processing. However, Srinivasan teaches the use of a webpage interface for submitting print jobs, and fails to explicitly teach the use of a search request, or notifying a user of printers which meet specified criteria in an e-mail-based system, as claimed in independent claims 5 and 21 (**Srinivasan, Col. 2 lines 4-20, Col 4 lines 25-44**).

20. Claims 7-16 are allowed based on their dependency upon independent claim 5, and the addition of further limitations

21. Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GRANT FORD whose telephone number is (571)272-8630. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Mon-Thurs alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gmf
/Grant Ford/
Examiner, Art Unit 2141

/Andrew Caldwell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2142